

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 056115

14

ORIGIN L-02

INFO OCT-01 AF-05 ARA-10 EUR-06 NEA-05 ADP-00 /029 R

66660

DRAFTED BY: L/ OA: HDCAMITTA

APPROVED BY: L/ OA: HDCAMITTA

----- 039610

R 271952 Z MAR 73

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY VIENNA

AMEMBASSY LIMA

AMEMBASSY GEORGETOWN

AMEMBASSY MONTEVIDEO

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

AMEMBASSY KUWAIT

AMEMBASSY OTTAWA

AMEMBASSY LAGOS

AMEMBASSY NEW DELHI

UNCLAS STATE 056115

FOLLOWING SENT ACTION SECSTATE MARCH 27, FROM USUNNY REPEATED
TO YOU QUOTE:

UNCLAS USUN 1054

E. O. 11652: N/ A

TAGS: PBOR, UN

SUBJECT: LOS, WORKING GROUP OF SUBCOMMITTEE II, MARCH 26

1. SUMMARY: WORKING GROUP CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF UNITY VERSUS
PLURALITY OF REGIMES WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON TERRITORIAL SEA
CONCEPT. AUSTRIA, PERU, GUYANA, URUGUAY, NIGERIA, USSR, KUWAIT,
CANADA, IRAQ, AND INDIA CONTRIBUTED TO GENERAL DISCUSSION. PERU
AND URUGUAY INDICATED FLEXIBILITY ON CONTENT OF 200- MILE CLAIM.

2. AUSTRIAN REP IDENTIFIED FOUR ASPECTS OF PLURALITY:
SUBJECT MATTER (E. G., NAVIGATION, MARINE ENVIRONMENT, SCIENTIFIC
RESEARCH, EXPLORATION OF RESOURCES), LIMITS, REGIONAL REGIMES,
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 STATE 056115

AND CATEGORIES OF STATES (E. G., MEMBERS OR NONMEMBERS OF TREATY,
COASTAL STATE OR NONCOASTAL STATE, ETC.). HIS EFFORTS WERE
INTENDED TO CATEGORIZE ELEMENTS OF PLURALITY OF REGIMES IN

ORDER TO ASSIST IN ANALYSIS OF CONCEPT.

3. PERUVIAN REP POINTED OUT THAT TERRITORIAL SEA LIMITS COULD NOT BE SAME FOR ALL PARTS OF WORLD BECAUSE OF VARYING GEOGRAPHIC PECULARITIES. IT WAS POSSIBLE TO DISTINGUISH TWO ZONES WITHIN TERRITORIAL SEA AS HAD BEEN DONE BY LEGISLATION IN URUGUAY WHICH DESIGNATED INNOCENT PASSAGE UP TO 12 MILES WITH UNIMPAIRED FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION BEYOND 12 MILES. BRAZIL HAD FOUND EXAMPLES OF PLURALITY OF REGIMES IN THAT 200 MILE TERRITORIAL SEA PROVIDED FOR INNER 100 MILES BEING RESERVED EXCLUSIVELY FOR BRAZILIAN NATIONALS WHILE OUTER 100 MILES WAS AVAILABLE FOR OUTSIDERS. PERU SAW NO CONFLICT BETWEEN RIGHTS OF COASTAL STATE AND RIGHTS OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY. IN THEIR VIEW, ABSTRACT INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY CONSISTED MAINLY OF COASTAL STATES.

4. GUYANAN REP INDICATED THAT HE DID NOT UNDERSTAND CONCEPT OF PLURALITY AS EXPRESSED BY PERUVIAN REP. PLURALITY OF REGIMES CONCEPT MADE SENSE FOR PATRIMONIAL SEA BUT NOT FOR TERRITORIAL SEA WHICH HAD DEFINED CONTENT. (LATER, GUYANAN REP EXPRESSED APPRECIATION FOR FLEXIBILITY SHOWN BY PERU AND URUGUAY IN INDICATING THAT TERM TERRITORIAL SEA COULD BE CHANGED.)

5. PERUVIAN REP RESPONDED TO GUYANAN REP THAT NEW CONCEPTS WERE NEEDED TO REPLACE OUTMODED CONCEPTS SUCH AS TERRITORIAL SEA. EVEN WITHIN TERRITORIAL SEA, TRADITIONAL DOCTRINE OF INNOCENT PASSAGE LIMITED FULL SOVEREIGNTY. IF LIMITATION WERE PERMISSIBLE WITHIN 12 MILES, WHY NOT BEYOND? IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE TO HAVE INNOCENT PASSAGE UP TO 12 MILES WITH FREE TRANSIT IN ZONE BEYOND UP TO 200 MILES. PERUVIAN REP SUGGESTED THAT TERRITORIAL SEA MIGHT BE CALLED SOMETHING ELSE MORE APTLY REFLECTING ECONOMIC AND ECOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENTS WHICH HAD RECENTLY EMERGED. IF TRADITIONAL TERMS WERE INSUFFICIENT, THEN NEW ONES SHOULD BE FOUND WHICH WOULD SECURE RIGHTS AND INTERESTS OF ALL STATES.

6. REP OF URUGUAY REINFORCED PERUVIAN STATEMENT, AND COMMENTED THAT PATRIMONIAL SEA WAS "VERY FRUITFUL" NEW CONCEPT. CONCEPT OF FREE SEA WAS UNDER REVISION AS OCEAN RESOURCES ARE NOW UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 STATE 056115

RECOGNIZED AS BEING EXHAUSTIBLE. URUGUAY WAS ALSO WILLING TO CHANGE LABELS TO CORRESPOND WITH NEW CONDITIONS.

7. SOVIET REHFSUGGESTED THAT CONCEPTS WHICH WERE UNCLEAR OR WHICH HAD NOT SERVED NEEDS SHOULD BE CHANGED. HOWEVER, FOR CONCEPTS WHICH HAD JUSTIFIED THEMSELVES, REVISION WAS UNNECESSARY. SOVIET DRAFT ARTICLES ON TERRITORIAL SEA PROVIDED THAT COASTAL STATES COULD CLAIM TERRITORIAL WATERS UP TO 12 MILES MAXIMUM. IF GEOGRAPHICAL CIRCUMSTANCES DICTATED A NARROWER TERRITORIAL SEA, THEN SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD DETERMINE BREADTH. SOVIET REP

SUGGESTED THAT TRADITIONAL CONCEPTS BE USED PROVISIONALLY IN ORDER TO MOVE AHEAD WITH WORK.

8. KUWAIT REP COMMENTED THAT PLURALITY OF REGIMES COULD BE APPLICABLE WITHIN TERRITORIAL SEA AND PATRIMONIAL SEA. IT MIGHT BE USEFUL TO LEARN MORE ABOUT EXISTING LAW AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF NEW CONCEPTS TO IT.

9. CANADIAN REP INDICATED SLIGHT DISPLEASURE WITH PHILOSOPHICAL TONE OF WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION. TRADITIONAL CONCEPT OF TERRITORIAL SEA DID NOT INCLUDE TOTAL SOVEREIGNTY AND SOME STATES HAD SUGGESTED SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS FOR STRAITS. THUS, IT WAS ACKNOWLEDGED BY MANY THAT TRADITIONAL CONCEPT OF TERRITORIAL SEA SHOULD BE CHANGED. EVEN WITH RESPECT TO HIGH SEAS REGIME, IT HAD ALWAYS BEEN RECOGNIZED THAT FLAG STATE JURISDICTION WAS APPLICABLE SO PLURALITY EXISTED THERE. SPEAKING PERSONALLY, BEESLEY SAW NO DIFFICULTY IN SAYING THAT COASTAL STATE POLLUTION ZONE WAS SUBJECT TO HIGH SEAS REGIME. WHAT WAS IMPORTANT WAS TO WORK OUT SOLUTION TO CONFLICTING USE PROBLEMS. CANADIAN REP QUESTIONED HOW PRESENT GENERAL DISCUSSION WOULD BE APPLICABLE TO SPECIFIC PROBLEMS BEFORE WORKING GROUP.

10. NIGERIAN REP SUGGESTED STICKING TO TERMS WHICH WERE WELL-DEFINED. HE DID NOT THINK PLURALITY OF REGIMES MADE SENSE WHEN APPLIED TO TERRITORIAL SEA, BUT WAS APPLICABLE TO WATER AREAS BEYOND. NIGERIA FAVORED USE OF TERM "ECONOMIC ZONE" FOR AREA BEYOND.

11. REP OF IRAQ POINTED OUT DIFFERENCE WHICH HAD EMERGED FROM DISCUSSION REGARDING CREATING, ON THE ONE HAND, NEW CONCEPTS SUCH AS ECONOMIC ZONE AND PATRIMONIAL SEA AND, ON THE OTHER HAND, EXTENSION OF TERRITORIAL SEA CONCEPT. DIFFERENCE SEEMED UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 STATE 056115

MORE IN APPROACH THAN SUBSTANCE.

12. INDIAN REP STATED BASIC PROBLEM WAS RECONCILIATION OF NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND SHIPPING WITH COASTAL STATE DESIRE FOR JURISDICTION OVER RESOURCES. HE FELT THAT ANOTHER LIMIT WAS NECESSARY FOR COASTAL EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE BEYOND THE TERRITORIAL SEA. CONCEPTUAL DIFFERENCE WAS WHETHER TERRITORIAL SEA WAS UMBRELLA CONCEPT WITH RESOURCE JURISDICTION UNDER IT OR TERRITORIAL SEA WAS NARROW BELT WITH ECONOMIC ZONE BEYOND. QUESTION WAS SOVEREIGNTY OF COASTAL STATE MINUS CERTAIN RIGHTS OR MORE FUNCTIONAL APPROACH WITH VARIOUS LIMITS. CRUCIAL ISSUE WAS WHETHER RESIDUAL POWER WAS IN COASTAL STATE OR IN HIGH SEAS REGIME. INDIAN FAVORED FUNCTIONAL APPROACH IN AREA BEYOND TERRITORIAL SEA WHICH WOULD SPECIFY COASTAL STATE RIGHTS WITH REMAINDER AS HIGH SEAS RESIDUUM. SCHAUFLE UNQUOTE ROGERS

UNCLASSIFIED

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 07 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 27 MAR 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: n/a
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: n/a
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment:
Disposition Date: 01 JAN 1960
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973STATE056115
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: L/ OA: HDCAMITTA
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730348/abqceiex.tel
Line Count: 163
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ORIGIN L
Original Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: n/a
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 16 NOV 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <16-Nov-2001 by elbezefj>; APPROVED <21 FEB 2002 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> jms 980105
Subject: LOS, WORKING GROUP OF SUBCOMMITTEE II, MARCH 26
TAGS: PBOR, UN
To: VIENNA
LIMA
GEORGETOWN
MONTEVIDEO
MOSCOW
KUWAIT
OTTAWA

LAGOS
NEW DELHI

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005